Application No.: 10/561,543 Docket No.: 0951-0177PUS1
Reply dated January 26, 2011 Page 4 of 5

Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2010

## REMARKS

## Status of the Claims

Claims 5, 6, 9, 10, and 14 are now present in this application. Claims 5 and 14 are independent.

Claims 5 and 14 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,554,275 (Tranquilla) in view of U.S. Patent 6,731,393 (Currans). Further, claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tranquilla taken together with Currans and further in view of U.S. Application Publication 2003/0090050 (Sueoka). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

The Examiner indicates that claims 5 and 14 can be rejected because the claimed "if the other original document is positioned between..." is a conditional that need not ever occur. (Office Action at page 3, paragraph beginning "Regarding the recitation "stopping the reading operation...," and Office Action at paragraph bridging pages 5-6).

In the section "Response to Arguments," the Examiner recommends changing "if" to "based on," such that the phrase would instead recite: "hased on the other original document being positioned between..."

Applicants have amended claims 5 and 14 as recommended by the Examiner. As claims 5 and 14 had been amended to incorporate subject matter from allowable claim 8, and have made the change recommended by the Examiner in the Office Action, Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Application No.: 10/561,543 Docket No.: 0951-0177PUS1
Reply dated January 26, 2011 Page 5 of 5

Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2010

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 9 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent

form.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this

application.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or

rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and

complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present

application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in

condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs, Registration

No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort

to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: January 26, 2011 Respectfully submitted.

By A A D # 9822 Michael R. Cammarata

Michael R. Cammarata Registration No.: 39491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP 8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000